



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,582	07/07/2003	Richard A. Darrell	020375-040200	8946
20350	7590	02/27/2008	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER				
EIGHTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/615,582	DARRELL, RICHARD A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Narayanswamy Subramanian	3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicants' communication filed on December 23, 2007. Amendments to claim 11 have been entered. Rejections made under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been withdrawn in view of the amendments and persuasive arguments. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21 and 23 are currently pending in the application and have been examined. The rejections and response to arguments are stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claim 18 has rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory Subject matter.

35 USC 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof" (emphasis added).

Claim 18 of the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

Claim 18 merely recite elements of an apparatus or a system ("means for" corresponds to software program elements and not tangible hardware components) without showing any ability to realize functionality of the recited elements (i.e. functional descriptive material per se) and therefore is rendered inoperative lacking any utility.

Note that a computer (or software program) code cannot by itself perform the underlying function until it is loaded on some computer readable memory and accessed by the computer (or a processor). Functional descriptive material, per se, is not statutory. This is exemplified in *In re Warmerdam* 31 USPQ2d 1754 where the rejection of a claim to a disembodied data structure was affirmed. Thus a claim to a data structure, per se, or other functional descriptive material, including computer programs, per se, is not patent eligible subject matter. \

As per Applicants arguments on page 9 of the response “While the elements may be implemented in software, this is not a requirement. The elements may also be implemented in hardware”. The Examiner has interpreted the “means for” functionality in the claims broadly to correspond to software program elements. The statement “elements may also be implemented in hardware” is interpreted to mean that hardware is not a required part of the claimed system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11-15 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houvener et al (US Patent 6,397,194 B1) in view of Schultz et al (US Pub. No. 2001/0029470 A1).

Claims 1 and 11, Houvener discloses a method and system of presenting an image of a receipt to a consumer, the method comprising: electronically capturing a receipt (See Houvener

Column 1 lines 15-25); storing the receipt at a host computer system (See Houvener 1 Column lines 15-25 and Column 5 lines 37-41); receiving a request at the host computer system from a computer of the consumer to display the image of the receipt (See Houvener Column 10 lines 48-52, the user is interpreted to include the consumer); and transmitting an electronic file comprising the image of the receipt for display at the consumer computer (See Houvener Column 10 lines 58-62, the display device is interpreted to include display at the consumer computer). The host system, interface, a user computer are inherent in the disclosure of Houvener.

Houvener fails to teach the steps wherein the electronic file further comprises programming that causes at least one purchase item included on the receipt to appear as a selectable link to obtain more detailed information about item; receiving from the consumer computer information that defines at least one user-defined category based on product information; receiving a request at the host computer from the consumer computer to display a categorical listing of items purchased by the consumer, wherein the items are comprised by a plurality of receipts; for each of the plurality of receipts, consulting a database for product information relating to each item of the receipt; using the product information to sort the items into categories comprising the at least one user-defined category; and transmitting a second electronic file from the host computer system to the consumer computer, wherein the file comprises a listing of the items sorted into categories comprising the at least one user-defined category based on product information for display at the consumer computer.

Schultz teaches the steps of receiving information from the consumer computer (See Schultz Paragraphs 37, 40, 58, 67, the limitation “information that defines at least one user-

defined category based on product information” is not a positive recitation of the defining step and hence is not given patentable weight. The information that defines at least one user-defined category is interpreted as an intended use of the receiving step); wherein the electronic file further comprises programming that causes at least one purchase item included on the receipt to appear as a selectable link to obtain more detailed information about item (See Schultz Figures 1 and 9 and Paragraphs 28, 29, 35, 52-59); receiving a request at the host computer from the consumer computer to display a categorical listing of items purchased by the consumer, wherein the items are comprised by a plurality of receipts; for each of the plurality of receipts, consulting a database for product information relating to each item of the receipt; using the product information; and transmitting a second electronic file from the host computer system to the consumer computer, wherein the file comprises a listing of the items sorted into categories that include the at least one category based on product information for display at the consumer computer (See Schultz Figures 1 and 11 and Paragraphs 28, 29, 35, 37, 40, 52-59, 62, 65-67). The receipt organizer service sorts the receipts by categories selected (See Paragraphs 62 and 65). The limitation “to sort the items into categories comprising the at least one user-defined category” is interpreted as an intended use of the step of using the product information and hence not given patentable weight. The limitation “information that defines at least one user-defined category based on product information” is not a positive recitation of the defining step. This limitation describes the information received from the consumer computer and not the step of receiving the information. The step of receiving information from the consumer computer is performed regardless of whether the information defines or does not define at least one user-defined category. The limitation is interpreted as non-functional descriptive material because it

does not further limit the step of receiving information from the consumer computer. The descriptive material referenced above is non-functional and is not given patentable weight because there is no non-obvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and the manipulative step of receiving. When a prior art describes all the claimed structural and functional relationships between the descriptive material and the substrate, but prior art describes different descriptive material than the claim, then the descriptive material is non-functional. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the requisite process steps described in Houvener to any type nonfunctional data because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention. When a prior art describes all the claimed structural and functional relationships between the descriptive material and the substrate, but prior art describes different descriptive material than the claim, then the descriptive material is non-functional. The examiner need not give patentable weight to descriptive material absent a new and non-obvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and the substrate. See In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Ngai, 367 F.3d 1336, 70 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1862 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004).

Both Houvener and Schultz are concerned with the problem of providing a user with user-friendly means for storing and retrieving receipts. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Houvener to include teachings of Schultz. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that users would

have benefited from being able to store the transaction receipts electronically and gather information from stored receipts (See Schultz Paragraph 9).

Claim 18, Houvener discloses a system of presenting an image of a receipt to a consumer comprising: means for receiving an electronic image of a receipt (See Houvener Column 1 lines 15-25); means for storing the image (See Houvener 1 Column lines 15-25 and Column 5 lines 37-41); means for receiving a request from a computer relating to the consumer to display the image (See Houvener Column 10 lines 48-52, the user is interpreted to include the consumer); means for transmitting the image to the consumer computer (See Houvener Column 10 lines 58-62).

Houvener fails to teach the means for obtaining product information relating to an item on the receipt and means for categorizing a plurality of items on a receipt into user-definable categories according to the product information.

Schultz teaches the means for obtaining product information relating to an item on the receipt (See Schultz Figures 1 and 9 and Paragraphs 28, 29, 35, 52-59).

Both Houvener and Schultz are concerned with the problem of providing a user with user-friendly means for storing and retrieving receipts. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Houvener to include teachings of Schultz. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that users would have benefited from being able to store the transaction receipts electronically and gather information from stored receipts (See Schultz Paragraph 9).

Houvener fails to teach the means for categorizing a plurality of items on a receipt into user-definable categories according to the product information.

Official notice is taken that means for categorizing a plurality of items on a receipt into user-definable categories according to the product information is old and well known in the art. This also implies that user defined categories have been defined before. This helps the user to customize the view of the receipt according to user preferences.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Houvener to include this feature. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that users would have benefited from being able to customize the view of the receipt according to user preferences.

Claims 2 and 12, Houvener teaches the step wherein the receipt comprises a credit card receipt (See Houvener Column 2 lines 16-25).

Claim 3, Houvener teaches the step wherein the receipt comprises an image of the consumer's signature (See Houvener Column 1 lines 15-25).

Claim 4, Houvener teaches the step wherein the receipt is printed on paper at a point of sale and electronically capturing comprises scanning an image of the receipt to an electronic file (See Houvener Column 2 lines 23-27 and Column 1 lines 19-25).

Claims 5 and 13, Houvener teaches the step wherein electronically capturing comprises receiving a file from a point-of-sale device, wherein the file comprises an image of the consumer's signature (See Houvener Column 3 lines 24-48).

Claim 7, Schultz teaches the steps of receiving a selection of the purchase item from the consumer; consulting a database for information about the item; and transmitting a file comprising the information to the consumer (See Schultz Figures 1 and 9 and Paragraphs 28, 29, 35, 52-59, 67).

Claim 9, Schultz teaches the step wherein the second electronic file comprises programming that causes at least one item to appear as a selectable link to more detailed information about the item (See Schultz Paragraphs 52-59 and 67).

Claim 14, Houvener teaches the step wherein the image capture device is further configured to convert image information captured from a receipt into data (See Houvener Column 1 lines 15-25 and Column 3 lines 24-3\$, whereby the data may appear in an electronic image of the receipt as a selectable link relating to the data (See Schultz Figures 1 and 9 and Paragraphs 28, 29, 35, 52-59).

Claim 15, Houvener teaches the step wherein the interface is configured to provide communication between the host computer system and at least one point-of-sale device (See Houvener Column 5 lines 42-45).

Claim 17, Schultz teaches the step wherein the identifier is selected from the group consisting of UPC and SKU (See Schultz Paragraph 67).

6. Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al (US Pub. No. 2001/0029470 A1).

Claim 21, Schultz teaches a method of presenting receipt information to a consumer, comprising: receiving from a consumer computer information (See Schultz Paragraphs 37, 40, 58, 67, the limitation “information that defines at least one user-defined category” is an intended use language recitation of the defining step and hence is not given patentable weight); receiving a request at the host computer from a computer of the consumer to display a categorical listing of items purchased by the consumer, wherein the items are comprised by a plurality of receipts; for each of the plurality of receipts, consulting a database for information relating to each item of the

receipt; using the information; and transmitting an electronic file from the host computer system to the consumer computer, the electronic file comprising a list of the items sorted into at least one user-defined category for display at the consumer computer (See Schultz Figures 1 and 11 and Paragraphs 28, 29, 35, 37, 40, 52-59, 62, 65-67, the categories have been defined by a user). The receipt organizer service sorts the receipts by categories selected (See Paragraphs 62 and 65). The limitation “to sort the items into categories comprising the at least one user-defined category” is interpreted as an intended use of the step of using the product information and hence not given patentable weight. Schultz does not explicitly teach the step of “information that defines at least one user-defined category”. However the limitation “information that defines at least one user-defined category” is not a positive recitation of the defining step. This limitation describes the information and not the step of receiving the information. The step of receiving information from the consumer computer is performed regardless of whether the information defines or does not define at least one category. The limitation is interpreted as non-functional descriptive material because it does not further limit the step of receiving information from the consumer computer. Hence the limitation “the consumer computer that defines at least one category based on product information” is not given patentable weight (See discussion of claim 1 for additional clarification of this rejection).

Claim 23, Schultz teaches the step wherein the electronic file comprises programming that causes at least one item to appear as a selectable link to more detailed information about the item (See Schultz Paragraphs 52-59 and 67).

Response to Arguments

7. In response to Applicant's arguments "Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the references, and there is no reasonable expectation that the reference teachings could be combined successfully", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all as pointed out in *KSR v. Teleflex* 82 USPQ2d 1385, the prior art references need not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Prior art is not limited to just the references being applied, but includes the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art. The proper analysis of the claim is whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art after consideration of all the facts. From the rejection of the claims discussed above and in the responses enlisted below, the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art after consideration of all the facts. For the sake of brevity, these discussions have not been repeated.

In response to Applicant's request to provide support for the Official notice taken, the Examiner would like to present the Thompson et al reference (US Patent 6,282,552). Thompson describes (in the Abstract and in Column 3 line 31 – Column 5 line 7) the feature of categorizing a plurality of items on a receipt into user-definable categories according to the product information. The product information are the telephone call information, the user-defined categories are those selected by the user.

In response to Applicant's arguments "The Office Action fails to give patentable weight to "information that defines at least one user- defined category." The Applicant is unaware of any examination guideline that allows this", the Examiner would like to reiterate the clarification

made in the rejection above. The limitation describes the information received from the consumer computer and not the step of receiving the information. The step of receiving information from the consumer computer is performed regardless of whether the information defines or does not define at least one user-defined category. The limitation is interpreted as non-functional descriptive material because it does not further limit the step of receiving information from the consumer computer. The descriptive material referenced above is non-functional and is not given patentable weight because there is no non-obvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and the manipulative step of receiving. When a prior art describes all the claimed structural and functional relationships between the descriptive material and the substrate, but prior art describes different descriptive material than the claim, then the descriptive material is non-functional. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the requisite process steps described in Houvener to any type nonfunctional data because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention. When a prior art describes all the claimed structural and functional relationships between the descriptive material and the substrate, but prior art describes different descriptive material than the claim, then the descriptive material is non-functional. The examiner need not give patentable weight to descriptive material absent a new and non-obvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and the substrate. See In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Ngai, 367 F.3d 1336, 70 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1862 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). In response to Applicant's "Moreover, the information is later used in sorting the items", the Examiner would like to point out that the step of sorting has only

been recited as an intended use of “using the product information” step.

In response to Applicant’s arguments “Moreover, the cited references could not be successfully combined to produce a working embodiment of the Applicant's claimed invention. Houvener relates to scanning paper receipts. Schultz deals exclusively with electronic environments. There is no receipt generated by Schultz to be scanned by Houvener. There being no teaching that allows one to interface with the other, the system produced by the combination would fail to function properly”, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As pointed out by the Applicants Houvener relates to scanning paper receipts. Once the receipts are scanned, they become electronic receipts. Hence the teachings of Schultz can now be applied to the electronic receipts. Hence there is logical progression of technology by combining the teachings of the two references. The motivation to combine has been explained in the rejection and this motivation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant's other arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are not persuasive.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are listed in the enclosed form PTO-892.
9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Narayanswamy Subramanian whose telephone number is (571) 272-6751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached at (571) 272-6771. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft to the Patent Office is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only. For more information about the PMR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Narayanswamy Subramanian/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3691

February 18, 2008